



Consumers' Guide

The New
Consumer-
Consciousness

See page 3

VOL. 2, No. 7
JAN. 14, 1935

CONSUMER QUERIES *and* COMMENTS

CC "CAN YOU give me some idea what kind of apples are the best for the money?" asks a Washington consumer. The answer to that is, it depends on how apples are to be used. A few varieties are excellent for baking. Others are good for dessert or for general culinary purposes. To distinguish these varieties, consult "A Fruit and Buying Guide for Consumers", a U. S. Department of Agriculture Bulletin No. 167.

CC "I NOTICE", writes an observant consumer in Texas, "that the wholesale cost of rye flour and whole wheat flour is less than the cost of white flour. Why is it that the cost to consumers of rye bread and whole wheat bread are always higher than prices of white bread?" The reason seems to be that those two breads are considered specialties. They are sold in smaller quantities, and so at a higher unit cost. There is a greater demand for white bread. In many European countries where they are the more common forms of bread, their prices are lower than white bread prices.

CC "IF I wanted to know whether U. S. Grade C in peas were the best grade to buy for my purposes, how would I go about finding out?" inquires a New York con-

"Planning, in a democracy, is a method by which the people use foresight in deciding what they want to do in order to attain a better national condition of living."

C.C. Davis
Administrator,
A.A.A.

sumer. One very good way would be to compare the full descriptions of each grade given in the U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics Standards Announcements No. 140, which will be mailed to you free of charge.

CC SPEAKING OF BREAD, as we were a moment ago, did you weigh that loaf you bought today? A baker—and he ought to know—says it is a rare consumer who takes the trouble to make sure he is getting the full weight he is paying for.... And while we are on the subject, have you tried out that School Lunch Loaf, the formula for which was worked out by the Bureau of Home Economics. It contains dried skim milk, good for building strong bones, healthy teeth. That Bureau will send you the formula if you ask for it.

CC WIDE DIFFERENCE in the cost of wheat flour and wheat cereal bothers a consumer in Pennsylvania. With flour selling at 4 cents a pound, she wants to know why she is asked 24 cents for a certain wheat cereal "which probably costs less to mill." Costs of packaging, advertising, marketing, and selling, are probably the reason. Most cereals of the sort sell in small packages. Many families use such small quantities at a time that they seem to prefer to get it in packaged form.

CC "MY FAMILY can't afford all the whole milk it should have", a New York consumer tells us. "I'd like to know if I substituted other forms of milk how much I would have to buy to get the same food value." One quart of fluid whole milk, the U. S. Bureau of Home Economics says, is equal in food value to these products or combination of products; 17 ounces of evaporated milk; one quart of fluid skim milk and 1½ ounces of butter; five ounces of American Cheddar cheese; 4½ ounces of dried whole milk; 3½ ounces of dried skim milk and 1½ ounces of butter.

CC "WHAT IS the difference between eggs labelled 'U. S. Special' and 'U. S. Extra'?" asks a California consumer. These are the top two grades you are likely to find on the market. "Specials" are fine for convalescents. You can be sure of your breakfast eggs if they are "Extras."



On the Consumer Front

Why is it that people are thinking and talking consumer problems more today than two years ago?

THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, Jr., at the forefront of two consumer agencies in Washington—as Assistant Director, Consumers' Counsel, AAA, and Acting Executive Director of the Consumers' Advisory Board, NRA—gives some reasons why.

MEASURE a country's interest in creating goods and services for use and you can measure its consumer-mindedness.

CONSUMER problems all center around the development of a society which thinks in terms of the use to which goods will be put.

FOR YEARS Government has concerned itself with consumer problems. Such offices as the Bureau of Home Economics and the Food and Drug Administration have given real attention to such problems. Other Bureaus, such as the Bureau of Mines, of

Standards, of Agricultural Economics, and the Public Health Service have made their contributions.

ALMOST always the consumer phase of the activities of such Government offices, however, has been a minor one. Primarily they have approached consumer problems from the standpoint of producers.

THAT'S easy to understand. First, organized producer groups have been able—by economic and political pressure—to insist that their particular interests should be taken care of. Consumers' interests have

not been organized to any extent. Where they have been organized they have frequently been tied up closely with some producer group.

MORE important, it's become almost second nature to most of us to believe that fair competition between producers will protect consumers' interests.

LONG before the New Deal, people became aware that this ideal competition we have talked so much about is not the competition which exists in modern business activity. Where fair competition—consumers' best traditional protection—does not exist, then some other protection must be found.

WHEN some employee of one of the agencies within the New Deal talks with his constituents he is almost always asked: "Well, what has been done for the protection of the consumer under the New Deal?"

LET'S look over the alphabet of our new agencies to see where the new responsibility for consumer protection is being taken by the Government.

FIRST and most clear-cut evidence of New Deal consumer interest is found in the program of the Tennessee Valley Authority. For a long time rates charged by electric power companies have been recognized as of such major consumer interest that they have been brought under the jurisdiction of many State commissions. Much of this regulation, however, has been an attempt to guarantee the owner a fair return on a fair value of his property, rather than reducing rates to consumers.

WORKING out a "yard stick" for electric power rates, as TVA is doing, is a major recognition of the tremendous consumer interest involved in this particular industry. Effectiveness of this attack seems to

Development of an electric power rate "yardstick" is one of the byproducts of the Government's hydro-electric development on the Tennessee River. An architect's conception of the completed dam appears on page 3.

be recognized on every hand, particularly by the electric power companies.

ACTIVITIES of the TVA, furthermore, have not been limited to consumer interest in power rates. They

have been directed to building a fuller life for the people of the Tennessee Valley area. They have attempted to develop sound housing programs, proper relationship between industries, "proper" allocation of lands to industrial and housing purposes, expansion of education, public-health activities, and other projects too numerous to list.

SECOND evidence of consumer-mindedness is the New Deal's recognition of the problem of relief. It shocks us to know that there are five million heads of families on public relief. But at last we have been made aware of the tremendous unsatisfied needs of a large section of our population. In the past, great numbers of people have needed relief but most people did not know it. Only sporadically did the community or Government recognize it.

SIGNIFICANT in the new consideration given to relief is the question frequently raised, "How can we produce the things these families need"—not just, "What do these people need?"

THIRD illustration of the Government's recognition of consumer needs has been the steadily growing interest in housing. Though the main purposes of the plan seem more to stimulate business recovery and give work, than to give people adequate housing, advantages still accrue to consumers.

SUPPORT given to the cooperative movement is another evidence of the Government's interest in the consumer. Credit Unions—"baby banks"—through which consumers can cooperate to pool their savings to

cover their day-to-day risks were given a Magna Charta by act of Congress. Consumer cooperatives gained theirs by a Presidential order which provided that such organizations should not be discriminated against under NRA codes.

FINALLY, there are the three units within the Government with the word "Consumer" specifically in their names. These are the Consumers' Division of the National Emergency Council; the Consumers' Counsel of the AAA; and the Consumers' Advisory Board of the NRA. Each tackles a different angle of consumers' problems.

CONSUMERS' Division of the NEC has established and is counselling county consumers' councils in about 200 counties scattered throughout the country. These councils were founded on an experimental basis. In some cases, they consist of a small group of a half dozen people, picked from a community because of their recognized ability as representatives of the public interest, rather than the interests of any existing organization. In other cases they consist of as many as 25 or 30 or 40 individuals chosen as delegate representatives of existing organizations.

PROGRAMS of these councils have been as varied as the individuals participating or represented. Some groups have regarded themselves as primarily "Blue Eagle" enforcement agencies. Others have cooperated with local Better Business Bureaus to correct dishonest advertising. Still others have been interested in educating the community to be more intelligent buyers. Some have done valuable work as a price-collecting and reporting agency. Here and there

Recognition by the Government of the need to provide relief for the millions of unemployed consumers is one of the important marks of the new consumer-consciousness.

councils have studied local conditions surrounding the production and marketing of milk, bread, coal, and other commodities. Frequently their reports are of value in enabling consumer representatives advising on NRA codes or AAA marketing agreements to be better informed as to the way these governmentally sponsored programs are developing.

UNTIL the Consumers' Division set its hand to the job, there was no agency in Washington bringing together information existing in the various Government bureaus which is valuable to consumers.

THE ACT creating the NRA contains an implicit recognition of the significance of the consumer. It is based on the general theory that the way to start the upward swing of business is to put increased purchasing power in the hands of workers, as consumers, so that they can buy back the products of their industry.

EVALUATING the extent to which this theory has been carried into practice at this time is impossible. An important step was taken when the Consumers' Advisory Board was made a part of the NRA. Constantly this Board has pointed out the impractical character of many of the price-fixing devices under codes of fair competition and has stressed the necessity for constant recognition of consumer interest if



codes are not to become self-defeating agencies.

IN THE HURLY BURLY of the early days of the NRA, little attention was paid to opinions of consumer advisors. However, as time has gone on their counsel has been sought increasingly. Today, I think it is safe to say that no major decision is made by the National Industrial Recovery Board without consultation and consideration of the views of the three Advisory Boards—including the Consumers.

RECOGNITION of consumer interest in the agricultural-recovery program is just as implicit in the Agricultural Adjustment Act as is recognition of the same interest in the NIRA. It is the stated purpose of this Act to "establish a balance between production and consumption of farm products."

CONSUMER interest in processing taxes is also clearly stressed. The Administration recognizes that these taxes, as a method of financing benefit payments to farmers cooperating in the adjustment program, are in the main taxes on consumers for the benefit of farmer producers. Furthermore, if they are pyramided, they may bear more heavily on consumers than they should.

TWO justifications are made for these taxes: First, that farmers had in a sense been "taxed" for the benefit of consumers for over a decade because of the very low price of farm products in relation to prices of industrial products. Second, that recovery can come only if a more equitable balance is established between prices of both types of product.

ONE function of the Consumers' Counsel of the AAA is to see that the processing taxes are not pyramided. Attack is made on this problem by publicity. Another function is to make economic analyses of the various phases of the agricultural program from the standpoint of the consumer, and to assist in drafting and reviewing marketing agreements.

THESE AGREEMENTS are somewhat akin to NRA codes of fair competition. For example, the growers and shippers of citrus fruits agree to a regulation of the flow of fruit to the ultimate consumer. The AAA approves the agreement and provides a method for enforcing it.

ULTIMATE results of such agreements and enforcements will prove their value to consumers. The Consumers' Counsel has supported the position of the Administration that such arrangements should not become merely instruments for securing monopolistic advantages. It has insisted that such arrangements between marketing groups should not be used to the disadvantage of the consumer or the farmer.


WEAKNESSES of the Consumers' Counsel go back to the fact that it is a part of an administrative agency concerned primarily with an agricultural production-control program. The public attitude and actions of the Secretary of Agriculture and the officials of the AAA have indicated a genuine concern for the problems of the consumer and a frank recognition that pushing a restriction program too far would harm not only the consumer but also the producers of agricultural commodities.

CONSUMER interests are obviously as broad as the desire for things. Not all of them can be protected or promoted by agencies of the Government, working within a business economy. Out of the experience of the New Deal consumer offices, three objectives stand out:

FIRST is the protection of consumer interest in prices. This involves studying the way prices are made, their interrelation, their effect on consumption.

SECOND is establishing the bargaining position of the consumer. In some industries this can be achieved through adequate and effective competition. In others, buyers' representatives on code authorities would be helpful.

[Concluded on Page 23]



These foods for a family of four
(two moderately active adults; 1 child under 4; 1 girl 4-7 years)
each week
will provide an adequate diet at minimum cost

BREADS

11 $\frac{3}{5}$ lbs. flour,
cereals
or
5 $\frac{2}{5}$ lbs. bread
and
8 $\frac{1}{10}$ lbs. flour,
cereals

MILK

22 $\frac{4}{5}$ Quarts
or
approximately
equal food-value
in evaporated
milk, cheese,
or skim milk
and butter

FRUITS and VEGETABLES

9 $\frac{4}{5}$ lbs. potatoes,
sweet potatoes
1 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. dried
beans, peas, nuts
4 lbs. tomatoes
citrus fruits
5 $\frac{1}{5}$ lbs. leafy green,
yellow vegetables
1 $\frac{1}{5}$ lbs. dried
fruits
4 $\frac{9}{10}$ lbs. other
vegetables and fruits

MEATS etc.

27 $\frac{1}{10}$ lbs. lean
meat, fish,
poultry
16 eggs

FATS and SUGARS

2 $\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. fats
2 $\frac{3}{10}$ lbs. Sugars

CORN MEAL OATMEAL

RICE

SALMON

SUGAR

BROWN SUGAR

BUTTER

MOLASSES

CREAM

SALAD OIL

MAPLE SYRUP

PARINA



A Tennessee cotton farmer shows his AAA check to his three sons. ↑



Shipping surplus barley grown in California to New York to relieve the feed shortage in eastern areas. →

YEAR-END accounting of farmers' 1934 cash income shows a total of around \$6,000,000,000—almost a billion dollars more than went into farm pocketbooks in 1933. This represents pay for produce sold commercially and to the Government, and rental and benefit payments. Despite the increased cost of things farmers buy, the balance of 1934 income available for farm family living, improvement, and savings, is expected to look a lot better than it did the year before. Not all farmers gained. Drought dealt a hard blow to many. Better prospects seem ahead for all farmers, weather permitting. How much better, depends also on city workers getting bigger incomes and on American agriculture's regaining foreign markets.

Consumer-Farmer Briefs

from Washington

ONE-THIRD of farmers' billion-dollar gain in income was made up of rental and benefit payments—compensation for join-

ing up in basic crop control programs. From January 1 to December 15, 1934, these payments totaled \$372,000,000. Another \$108,000,000 went to farmers in drought areas for cattle, sheep, and goats, purchased by the Govern-

ment. In 1935, rental and benefit payments are expected to reach \$476,000,000.

AAA

STEPPING-UP production is just as much a part of agricultural adjustment as stepping it down. Last year three million farmers were partners with the AAA in controlled reduction. Reduced acreage, plus drought, erased surpluses, brought down supplies of many farm products. Now expansion is in order for some commodities. This time not the hit-or-miss, confused, each-farmer-for-himself, kind of expansion of the old days, but controlled, orderly, cooperative planning.

IN BRIEF, here are the 1934-35 farm-expansion programs: Wheat, close to 6

percent more than last year; Cotton, 25 percent more than last year; Corn, about 12 percent over last year's maximum; Hogs, 20 percent more than last year; Tobacco, increase of from 5 to 15 percent of the base acreage.

AAA

MARKETING agreement control of the smaller farm crops under the AAA brought good returns to farmers of these products. Their income was increased from \$197,000,000 in 1933 to \$244,000,000 in 1934. During the year there were 23 marketing agreements in effect, covering some 5,275 handlers and 128,400 growers. Forty-eight milk areas in 18 States, in which about a quarter of the milk consumed off farms is distributed, operated under Federal milk licenses during the year. Gains to dairy farmers on Class I milk are estimated at between 15 and 20 million dollars.

AAA

CONSUMERS' contribution to better incomes for farmers came, in part, from a 10 percent increase in the cost of foods. Consumers are beginning to return to farmers some of the benefits they got in the low food prices during depression years. Another contribution came from processing taxes on non-food farm products, such as cotton and tobacco. Probably less than 1 percent of the increase in consumers' total retail expenditures was due to all processing taxes.

AAA

INCOMES of food and beverage manufacturers looked a lot rosier in 1933 than in 1932, reports of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, just published, show. Over the 1933 calendar year, 4,878 firms earned a net income of \$296,852,785 as against \$153,316,875 in 1932. Income taxes paid by these firms more than doubled, from \$19,555,446 in 1932 to \$42,296,778 in 1933. Losses

decreased. In 1932, 10,099 firms reported deficits totalling \$177,526,748. A year later, the 9,034 firms reporting deficits had a total of losses of only \$80,859,385.

AAA

DON'T FEAR you are stinting on quality if you buy bargains in evaporated milk. Quality in this product is practically uniform, not only between brands but in cans of the same brand. Differences in price represent differences in cost of manufacture and marketing.

EVAPORATED milk, with almost no exceptions, measures up to Government standards. You can be sure of at least 7.8 percent milk fat, 25.5 percent of milk solids, not less than a total of 33.7 percent for both.

TESTS made by the Food and Drug Administration on 46 different cans (some of the same brand) show variations in actual count did not amount to more than 2 points. Milk fat content varied only from the minimum to 8.05 percent. Milk solids varied only from the minimum to 27.27 percent. Total of both tested from the minimum to 35.10 percent.

[Concluded on Page 23]

One Texas farm family used part of their cotton benefit payments to buy a home canner and sealer for preserving garden foods.



YOUR FOOD BILL

MIDDLE of December average retail food prices showed another drop in the series of drops which have been registered since the middle of September. If you check back over the years you will find this falling off from November to December is the usual seasonal movement of consumer food prices. Usually the peak occurs in November; this year it was reached in September.

INDEX of retail food prices stood at 114.3 percent of the 1913 average on December 18. This compares with 114.6 percent on December 4, 114.9 on November 20, all of 1934, and with 103.9 percent, the average for December 19 the year before. The drop from September prices was 2½ points.

OUTSTANDING changes in prices from December 4 to 18 occurred in the fruits, vegetable, and poultry groups. Spinach went up 1.9 cents a pound, lettuce advanced 0.5 cent a head, and carrots the same amount per bunch. Oranges, on the other hand, dropped 1.5 cents a dozen. Prices of hens increased 0.1 cent, while eggs declined 2.3 cents per dozen. Whole milk showed no change in price, but butter and cheese advanced slightly. Beef and pork as a whole tended downward, with exceptions in the price of chuck roast, which held to the same price as two weeks earlier, and lard which cost 0.4 cent per pound more on the latter date. Prices of all cuts of lamb tended upward. Bread, cereal products, and canned vegetables showed no change.

COMPARED with a year ago, the foods which have shown the greatest gains are lard, which on December 18 was 66 percent above the price on December 19, 1933. Butter is 46.9 percent higher. Canned peas are 27.2 percent more expensive; hens, 23.1 percent; and pork chops 22.7 percent.

CHANGES IN CITY RETAIL PRICES

Kind of Food	Dec. 19 1933	Dec. 4 1934	Dec. 18 1934	Percent change in year
<u>Dairy Products</u>				
Milk, qt.....	11.2	11.7	11.7	+4.5
Cheese, lb.....	22.3	24.0	24.1	+8.1
Butter, lb.....	24.1	35.1	35.4	+46.9
<u>Beef</u>				
Round steak, lb.....	24.2	27.5	27.4	+13.2
Rib roast, lb.....	19.9	22.9	22.8	+14.6
Chuck roast, lb.....	14.8	16.9	16.9	+14.2
<u>Pork</u>				
Chops, lb.....	19.8	23.9	24.3	+22.7
Lard, lb.....	9.4	15.2	15.6	+66.0
Who. smo. ham, lb..	—	23.2	23.1	—
<u>Lamb</u>				
Leg of lamb, lb.....	20.7	23.4	23.6	+14.0
Breast lamb, lb.....	—	10.2	10.3	—
Square chuck, lb....	—	17.4	17.6	—
<u>Poultry and eggs</u>				
Hens, lb.....	19.9	24.4	24.5	+23.1
Eggs, doz.....	32.1	39.6	37.3	+16.2
<u>Bread</u>				
White, lb.....	7.9	8.3	8.3	+5.1
Rye, lb.....	8.6	8.9	8.9	+3.5
Whole wheat, lb.....	—	9.0	9.0	—

(continued)

PRICES of other foods marched downhill during the year. Important declines occurred in cabbage prices which were 34.9 percent lower on December 18, 1934, than on December 19, 1933. Potatoes also dropped, 26.1 percent, in the same period. Wheat cereal and macaroni sold at about the same level as a year earlier. Rye bread cost only 3.5 percent more, and whole milk, white bread, and canned tomatoes about 5 percent above a year ago.

FOOD SUPPLIES were again estimated in December. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics' Crop Reporting Board reported that the 1934 production of the 8 principal vegetables for canning and manufacture were about equal to the average for the 10 years from 1921 to 1930, but about 30 percent larger than production in 1933. Production of 17 vegetables for market in 1934 was

CHANGES IN CITY RETAIL PRICES

Kind of Food	Dec. 19 1933	Dec. 4 1934	Dec. 18 1934	Percent change in year
<u>Cereal Products</u>	¢	¢	¢	%
Flour, lb.....	4.7	5.1	5.1	+8.5
Macaroni, lb.....	15.8	15.8	15.8	0.0
Wheat cereal.....	24.1	24.3	24.3	+0.8
(28-oz. pkg.)				
<u>Vegetables - canned</u>				
Corn, #2 can.....	10.9	12.4	12.4	+13.8
Peas, #2 can.....	13.6	17.3	17.3	+27.2
Tomatoes, #2 can...	9.9	10.4	10.4	+5.1
<u>Vegetables - fresh</u>				
Potatoes, lb.....	2.3	1.7	1.7	-26.1
Onions, lb.....	3.8	4.0	4.1	+7.9
Cabbage, lb.....	4.3	2.6	2.8	-34.9
<u>Vegetables - fresh</u>				
Lettuce, head.....	—	8.8	9.3	—
Spinach, lb.....	—	7.0	8.9	—
Carrots, bunch.....	—	5.3	5.8	—
<u>Fruit - canned</u>				
Peaches, #2½ can...	17.4	19.3	19.3	+10.9
Pears, #2½ can.....	20.4	22.7	22.6	+10.8
Pineapple, #2½ can	—	22.6	22.6	—
<u>Fruit - fresh</u>				
Apples, lb.....	—	5.7	5.9	—
Bananas, doz.....	24.8	22.5	22.3	-10.1
Oranges, doz.....	25.8	30.3	28.8	+11.6

nearly a fourth larger than average and close to 9 percent greater than in 1933. The 1934 crop of fruit was 5 percent above average and the same as production in 1933. 1934 production of 8 grain crops was only about two-thirds as large as the crop in 1933. As consumers know, the severe drought in the Central States dealt its worst blow to these farm products.

MOST important changes in food supplies in December were caused by several nights of unusually cold weather which happened in the middle of the month over an area extending from Florida to Alabama and as far north as South Carolina. Considerable acreages of early vegetables and strawberries were wiped out in some sections. Florida citrus fruits were injured to some extent. Tangerines suffered most damage. Injury to sound oranges and grapefruit were successively lighter. It is doubtful if the

YOUR FOOD BILL

(continued)

effects of the freeze will be felt to any great extent except in the case of some temporary shortening of the supply, with consequent higher prices, for a few commodities, such as early strawberries, snap beans, eggplant, and tomatoes. Early cabbage was damaged and early potatoes cut to the ground but the ultimate effect on production can not be determined at this time.

SPREAD between prices paid by consumers and the prices received by farmers for the equivalent farm produce in 14 important foods continued to narrow through December. The cost of these foods in amounts purchased by a typical American family would cost \$19.08, according to average prices on December 18. The price paid to the farmer averaged \$7.70. The difference between these two prices, \$11.38 which represents all the charges between the farmer and the consumer including processing taxes, is the smallest spread since May 8, 1934.

It is still somewhat larger than for the first four months of 1934. According to these figures, the farmer is now receiving 40 cents of the consumer's food dollar. This is the highest share the farmer has had since the beginning of 1931.

HOW ABOUT making a New Year's FOOD resolution? Here's one suggested by the U. S. Bureau of Home Economics:

To build the body, give it warmth and energy, and keep it in good order, we draw on at least five classes of food: Milk, for one; vegetables and fruits for another; bread and cereals for a third; meat, fish, eggs, or cheese; and finally, fats and sugars. Because there is little danger of our neglecting bread or meat, nutritionists advise us to make sure first of all of the "protective foods"—milk, vegetables and fruits, and, when they can be afforded, eggs also. Bread, meat, and potatoes should be added to make up the calorie quota.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

MILK remained unchanged in price at 11.7 cents per quart which is 4.5 percent higher than a year ago. Cheese prices tended upward slightly, gaining 0.1 cent over the December 4 price and 0.2 cent over the price on November 20. The December 18 price of cheese was 8.1 percent higher than at the same time in 1933. Butter prices advanced 0.3 cent over both the December 4 and November 20 price and on December 18 was 46.9 percent higher than a year ago.

MILK PRODUCTION per cow on December 1 was the lowest for any recent year and about 6 percent below the average December 1 production. This lower production per cow and reduced numbers of milk cows on farms brought total milk production down to 5 or 6 percent below the production for the same date last year. With feed prices increasing more rapidly than dairy product prices and feed supplies short in many areas, a light production is in prospect for the winter and early spring months unless the winter is unusually open and mild.

BUTTER PRODUCTION during the early fall was unusually heavy but with the end of the pasture season production has declined in recent weeks. Cold storage holdings of butter on December 1 were somewhat below average for that date.

CHEESE PRODUCTION has been heavy and stocks are large, but heavy movement into consuming channels, the prospects for low dairy production during the winter months, and the rise in butter prices have tended to strengthen the cheese market.

AVERAGE FARM PRICE of wholesale milk increased from \$1.65 per 100 pounds on November 15 to \$1.69 per 100 pounds on December 15. Butterfat increased from 27.2 cents per pound to 28.2 cents per pound during the same period.

Average Retail Prices, December 18, 1934 (cents)

Markets	Milk (qt.)	Cheese (lb.)	Butter (lb.)
United States.....	11.7	24.1	35.4
North Atlantic:			
Boston.....	11.3	23.6	35.1
Bridgeport.....	14.0	27.9	36.8
Buffalo.....	12.0	24.4	34.9
Fall River.....	13.0	24.0	34.1
Manchester.....	12.0	24.7	35.1
Newark.....	13.0	26.1	37.4
New Haven.....	14.0	31.8	33.3
New York.....	12.5	28.1	37.5
Philadelphia.....	11.0	28.2	37.5
Pittsburgh.....	12.7	24.9	35.5
Portland, Maine.....	10.7	24.7	36.1
Providence.....	13.0	23.1	35.0
Rochester.....	12.0	25.8	33.9
Scranton.....	11.0	26.2	34.9
South Atlantic:			
Atlanta.....	14.0	21.5	36.3
Baltimore.....	11.0	25.5	39.5
Charleston, S. C.....	13.0	20.7	35.0
Jacksonville.....	15.0	20.6	35.9
Norfolk.....	14.0	20.7	35.9
Richmond.....	12.0	22.2	36.5
Savannah.....	14.0	20.2	35.3
Washington, D. C.....	13.0	26.2	38.0
North Central:			
Chicago.....	10.0	27.1	35.2
Cincinnati.....	12.0	25.1	33.8
Cleveland.....	11.0	26.3	33.8
Columbus.....	10.0	24.9	33.2
Detroit.....	11.0	24.6	34.9
Indianapolis.....	10.0	24.4	34.9
Kansas City.....	12.0	23.6	33.8
Milwaukee.....	10.0	24.4	34.5
Minneapolis.....	9.0	23.6	33.9
Omaha.....	10.0	23.0	32.9
Peoria.....	7.0	22.1	33.5
St. Louis.....	11.0	23.0	35.7
St. Paul.....	9.0	23.5	34.2
Springfield, Ill.....	10.0	22.8	34.5
South Central:			
Birmingham.....	13.0	20.5	36.0
Dallas.....	10.0	24.0	33.3
Houston.....	12.0	20.3	36.7
Little Rock.....	12.0	21.9	32.7
Louisville.....	12.0	24.1	35.3
Memphis.....	11.3	19.8	33.8
Mobile.....	13.0	21.1	33.5
New Orleans.....	11.0	22.1	34.7
Western:			
Butte.....	11.0	22.5	36.5
Denver.....	11.0	24.2	34.2
Los Angeles.....	12.0	24.8	37.0
Portland, Oreg.....	11.2	22.8	37.2
Salt Lake City.....	10.0	23.1	35.6
San Francisco.....	12.0	28.8	37.4
Seattle.....	10.7	22.6	38.8

Average Retail Prices, December 18, 1934 (cents)

Markets	White (lb.)	Rye (lb.)	Whole wheat (lb.)
United States.....	8.3	8.9	9.0
North Atlantic:			
Boston.....	8.3	9.2	8.8
Bridgeport.....	8.7	9.1	9.2
Buffalo.....	8.4	8.4	9.3
Fall River.....	8.1	8.4	8.9
Manchester.....	8.9	9.6	9.4
Newark.....	9.4	9.4	9.5
New Haven.....	8.7	9.1	9.3
New York.....	8.9	8.9	9.5
Philadelphia.....	8.8	9.9	10.7
Pittsburgh.....	8.3	8.9	9.1
Portland, Maine.....	9.1	9.5	9.6
Providence.....	8.1	8.8	9.4
Rochester.....	8.1	8.2	8.9
Scranton.....	9.2	10.0	10.3
South Atlantic:			
Atlanta.....	8.9	9.4	9.0
Baltimore.....	8.8	9.2	9.5
Charleston, S. C.....	9.2	9.5	10.8
Jacksonville.....	9.8	9.9	10.0
Norfolk.....	8.5	8.7	9.0
Richmond.....	8.6	8.5	9.3
Savannah.....	9.6	9.7	10.4
Washington, D. C.....	8.3	8.8	8.9
North Central:			
Chicago.....	7.5	7.8	8.9
Cincinnati.....	7.8	9.6	9.6
Cleveland.....	7.8	8.1	8.7
Columbus.....	8.1	9.1	9.3
Detroit.....	7.2	7.6	7.6
Indianapolis.....	7.4	7.8	9.0
Kansas City.....	8.4	8.8	8.9
Milwaukee.....	7.0	6.9	7.8
Minneapolis.....	8.3	8.9	9.3
Omaha.....	8.3	8.9	8.4
Peoria.....	7.9	8.9	8.8
St. Louis.....	8.2	9.1	9.5
St. Paul.....	8.7	9.0	9.5
Springfield, Ill.....	8.7	9.6	9.6
South Central:			
Birmingham.....	9.6	9.8	9.9
Dallas.....	7.9	7.9	7.9
Houston.....	8.6	8.5	8.8
Little Rock.....	9.9	9.7	9.9
Louisville.....	7.4	8.0	8.6
Memphis.....	8.5	8.9	9.3
Mobile.....	9.1	9.7	9.7
New Orleans.....	8.3	8.7	9.6
Western:			
Butte.....	9.5	9.7	9.6
Denver.....	7.7	9.1	8.0
Los Angeles.....	7.8	9.6	8.2
Portland, Oreg.....	9.1	10.1	9.2
Salt Lake City.....	7.3	8.9	7.5
San Francisco.....	9.3	9.0	8.9
Seattle.....	9.1	9.7	9.1

BREAD

ALL BREAD PRICES remained unchanged from the average prices reported on both November 20 and December 4. The average price of white bread on December 18 was 5.1 percent above the price for the comparable date last year and rye bread prices 3.5 percent above a year ago.

WHILE RETAIL PRICES of bread are above a year ago the increase is reasonably well in line with the advance in the cost of flour to the baker. The price of bread is now at about its usual relationship with the cost of flour and other ingredients.

SPREAD between the retail price of bread and the cost of bread ingredients has widened since 1931-32 but is still less than in 1930-31 when the retail price of bread was about comparable to the present.

CEREAL PRODUCTS

NO CHANGE is reported in the average price of cereal products. On December 18 flour was 8.5 percent higher, wheat cereal 0.8 percent higher and macaroni the same as reported on December 19, 1933.

PRICES of all classes and grades of wheat at six markets on December 29 had regained losses recorded during the middle of the month and at \$1.14 per bushel were practically the same as at the close of November. Maintenance of the United States wheat prices appears to be the result of several factors including reports of heavy feeding of wheat, serious deficiencies in moisture in the western Great Plains regions, and rapidly advancing corn prices.

PRODUCTION of wheat in the United States in 1934 was about 6 percent below the crop of 1933 but nearly 20 percent smaller than production in any other year since 1904 and the smallest total crop since 1890.

AVERAGE PRICE of wheat received by farmers on December 15 represented a rise of nearly 3 percent over the price in the middle of November. This is about the normal seasonal rise in the farm price that ordinarily accompanies the usual seasonal decline in domestic stocks. The rise in prices brings the farm price of wheat up to 81 percent of prewar parity. Further advances in feed grains brought corn prices to 5 percent above parity, oat prices 7 percent above, and barley 2 percent above the prewar parity price.

INDEX of the general level of farm prices of grains on December 15 was 116 percent of the 1910-1914 average which represented an advance of seven points from the previous month.

Average Retail Prices, December 18, 1934 (cents)

Markets	Flour (lb.)	Maca- roni (lb.)	Wheat cereal (28-oz. pkg.)
United States.....	5.1	15.8	24.3
North Atlantic:			
Boston.....	5.0	16.0	23.5
Bridgeport.....	5.5	16.4	25.2
Buffalo.....	5.3	15.7	24.2
Fall River.....	5.1	15.6	23.1
Manchester.....	5.0	17.3	25.2
Newark.....	5.7	16.2	23.1
New Haven.....	5.2	16.1	22.1
New York.....	5.5	16.8	23.8
Philadelphia.....	4.8	16.6	21.9
Pittsburgh.....	4.7	16.0	23.1
Portland, Maine.....	5.1	17.4	24.2
Providence.....	5.3	15.2	23.1
Rochester.....	5.4	15.4	24.0
Scranton.....	5.2	18.3	24.0
South Atlantic:			
Atlanta.....	5.6	17.1	26.1
Baltimore.....	5.0	16.1	24.2
Charleston, S. C.....	5.7	16.9	25.0
Jacksonville.....	5.4	16.3	25.7
Norfolk.....	5.1	16.0	25.0
Richmond.....	5.1	15.1	23.3
Savannah.....	5.4	16.1	24.7
Washington, D. C.....	5.5	15.8	24.2
North Central:			
Chicago.....	4.9	14.6	24.9
Cincinnati.....	4.6	15.0	21.7
Cleveland.....	4.8	16.1	23.6
Columbus.....	4.3	16.6	26.8
Detroit.....	5.1	14.5	23.5
Indianapolis.....	4.6	15.7	25.4
Kansas City.....	4.9	15.3	23.6
Milwaukee.....	4.9	14.4	23.1
Minneapolis.....	5.1	14.5	22.8
Omaha.....	4.7	18.3	24.9
Peoria.....	5.1	17.5	25.4
St. Louis.....	5.0	16.8	25.9
St. Paul.....	5.0	14.3	24.0
Springfield, Ill.....	5.3	16.7	25.9
South Central:			
Birmingham.....	5.2	13.2	25.6
Dallas.....	5.0	17.6	24.7
Houston.....	5.0	13.1	23.1
Little Rock.....	5.0	16.3	27.8
Louisville.....	5.3	14.1	25.6
Memphis.....	5.6	16.6	25.4
Mobile.....	5.2	17.0	25.7
New Orleans.....	6.0	10.0	24.5
Western:			
Butte.....	5.3	16.7	26.6
Denver.....	4.2	17.5	22.2
Los Angeles.....	4.7	15.5	23.8
Portland, Oreg.....	4.4	15.8	25.7
Salt Lake City.....	4.0	17.9	25.2
San Francisco.....	5.1	16.5	24.0
Seattle.....	4.6	16.7	25.7

Average Retail Prices, December 18, 1934 (cents)

Markets	Round steak (lb.)	Rib roast (lb.)	Chuck roast (lb.)
United States.....	27.4	22.8	16.9
North Atlantic:			
Boston.....	35.9	26.9	22.5
Bridgeport.....	34.1	27.6	21.5
Buffalo.....	23.1	22.3	16.2
Fall River.....	33.8	23.5	19.3
Manchester.....	34.4	22.9	19.6
Newark.....	34.6	27.3	19.4
New Haven.....	37.4	28.3	20.5
New York.....	31.1	28.4	19.9
Philadelphia.....	31.4	28.3	19.8
Pittsburgh.....	26.8	23.9	17.5
Portland, Maine.....	31.9	24.2	17.8
Providence.....	34.9	26.8	20.0
Rochester.....	24.7	21.5	16.2
Scranton.....	30.6	25.9	19.1
South Atlantic:			
Atlanta.....	29.4	23.0	17.1
Baltimore.....	26.0	23.3	15.9
Charleston, S. C.....	26.8	21.3	14.8
Jacksonville.....	25.6	23.1	17.3
Norfolk.....	27.4	25.9	15.6
Richmond.....	29.4	25.3	16.8
Savannah.....	25.2	22.4	15.6
Washington, D. C.....	29.5	25.4	18.0
North Central:			
Chicago.....	24.9	25.3	18.8
Cincinnati.....	27.6	23.8	15.8
Cleveland.....	25.8	22.6	17.9
Columbus.....	29.1	23.2	18.3
Detroit.....	25.1	20.1	18.2
Indianapolis.....	28.2	21.2	17.1
Kansas City.....	24.2	20.3	15.1
Milwaukee.....	24.5	21.9	17.1
Minneapolis.....	24.1	20.0	15.7
Omaha.....	23.4	17.7	15.3
Peoria.....	24.8	17.5	14.9
St. Louis.....	28.4	20.8	17.3
St. Paul.....	24.3	20.5	16.6
Springfield, Ill.....	24.6	17.6	14.5
South Central:			
Birmingham.....	29.1	22.9	16.0
Dallas.....	31.5	25.5	16.5
Houston.....	26.4	21.5	13.5
Little Rock.....	25.2	20.3	14.6
Louisville.....	27.8	18.7	14.9
Memphis.....	27.2	22.1	14.9
Mobile.....	25.7	19.0	14.5
New Orleans.....	26.4	23.7	15.1
Western:			
Butte.....	20.0	18.2	13.0
Denver.....	23.9	18.4	15.3
Los Angeles.....	23.3	21.2	14.2
Portland, Oreg.....	19.2	17.2	12.8
Salt Lake City.....	22.9	17.8	13.6
San Francisco.....	25.8	23.4	15.4
Seattle.....	24.4	21.1	16.0

BEEF

RETAIL PRICE of beef declined slightly, continuing the downward trend begun in September. The price of round steak and rib roast both declined 0.1 cent between December 4 and December 18 while chuck roast prices remained unchanged during the same period. As compared with a year ago, however, round steak is 13.2 percent higher, rib roast 14.6 percent higher and chuck roast 14.2 percent higher on December 18, 1934, than on December 19, 1933.

THIS DOWNWARD TREND in retail beef prices was accompanied by unusually heavy receipts of cattle at the seven principal markets during the week ending December 18. During the last week of December receipts of cattle dropped off sharply, partially due to the holiday season and partly to stormy weather throughout a large part of the middle west.

WHOLESALE PRICES advanced sharply in response to lighter supplies and higher wholesale price of carcass beef. Wholesale prices of beef declined from \$7.43 per 100 pounds for the week ending December 1 to \$7.14 per 100 pound for the next week ending December 8. For the week of December 15 prices remained fairly steady at \$7.16 per 100 pounds from which point a rapid rise took place to \$7.77 per 100 pounds for the week ending December 29.

WITH THE NUMBER of cattle reduced to the lowest point in many years by the drought, which forced heavy marketings during the past summer, it seems likely that supplies of beef may be expected to be relatively light for some time.

FARM PRICE of beef cattle advanced between November 15 and December 15 from \$3.81 to \$3.88 per 100 pounds. The price of \$3.88 is about 24 percent above the price on December 15, 1933, but still only 59 percent of the prewar parity price.

PORK

SOME INCREASE occurred in the retail price of pork chops and lard, while ham registered a further fractional decline. Pork chops declined from November 20 to December 4 then advanced 0.6 cent per pound to December 18. Lard advanced 0.4 cent between these two dates. Hams declined 0.1 cent.

FOLLOWING a week of relatively heavy marketing of hogs, receipts at seven principal markets dropped off sharply during the week ending December 29. The quality of the hogs marketed was good and the proportions of unfinished light weight hogs were small.

WHOLESALE PRICES of hogs advanced about 1.5 percent between the first and 15th of December, then took a sharp upturn to the end of the month when the price was nearly 17 percent above the mid-month figure.

THIS SHARP UPTURN in prices is contrary to the usual seasonal movement in hog prices. This may be in part due to a decrease of about 48 percent in the fall pig crop of 1934 from that of 1933, a decrease of about 35 percent in the combined fall and spring pig crop of 1934, and a prospective decrease of 17 percent in the number of sows to farrow in the spring season of 1935 from the relatively small number farrowed in the spring of 1934. For the winter as a whole the market supplies of hogs are likely to be the smallest in a number of years.

FARM PRICE of hogs moved in conformity with the wholesale price and during the period from November 15 to December 15 advanced from \$5.04 to \$5.15 per 100 pounds. At the December 15 level, the farm price was 76.5 percent above the price on December 15, 1933, but was still only 57 percent of the prewar parity price.

Average Retail Prices, December 18, 1934 (cents)

Markets	Chops (lb.)	Lard (lb.)	Who. smo. ham (lb.)
United States.....	24.3	15.6	23.1
North Atlantic:			
Boston.....	23.7	15.7	25.0
Bridgeport.....	27.0	15.1	23.9
Buffalo.....	25.4	14.8	21.5
Fall River.....	25.7	14.0	24.2
Manchester.....	23.0	15.8	25.5
Newark.....	25.1	15.6	22.8
New Haven.....	23.2	14.1	23.6
New York.....	25.7	16.1	22.9
Philadelphia.....	27.5	15.6	24.1
Pittsburgh.....	24.9	15.1	23.4
Portland, Maine.....	25.1	15.5	25.4
Providence.....	25.0	14.5	23.4
Rochester.....	24.8	15.1	21.9
Scranton.....	26.4	16.6	22.9
South Atlantic:			
Atlanta.....	25.4	16.3	22.2
Baltimore.....	22.9	15.4	21.6
Charleston, S. C.....	21.4	15.7	21.5
Jacksonville.....	21.1	15.8	22.7
Norfolk.....	22.9	15.1	22.3
Richmond.....	24.3	15.1	21.1
Savannah.....	21.0	15.5	19.7
Washington, D. C.....	25.1	16.0	22.2
North Central:			
Chicago.....	24.3	15.2	22.2
Cincinnati.....	22.1	15.7	20.2
Cleveland.....	23.7	16.7	23.6
Columbus.....	25.2	15.3	23.5
Detroit.....	25.8	15.2	24.2
Indianapolis.....	22.6	14.9	22.5
Kansas City.....	22.6	15.5	22.5
Milwaukee.....	23.6	15.2	21.7
Minneapolis.....	24.2	15.1	23.0
Omaha.....	21.6	16.1	23.2
Peoria.....	22.8	16.0	23.1
St. Louis.....	24.9	15.2	22.7
St. Paul.....	22.9	15.4	22.7
Springfield, Ill.....	21.4	15.6	23.5
South Central:			
Birmingham.....	23.0	15.7	24.4
Dallas.....	25.9	16.6	27.3
Houston.....	23.8	15.1	21.9
Little Rock.....	21.5	16.0	23.1
Louisville.....	21.7	15.4	19.6
Memphis.....	20.7	15.5	22.4
Mobile.....	21.2	15.2	22.9
New Orleans.....	23.0	15.0	22.7
Western:			
Butte.....	23.3	17.6	23.9
Denver.....	23.1	15.8	23.5
Los Angeles.....	29.0	15.8	24.6
Portland, Oreg.....	26.0	16.5	23.9
Salt Lake City.....	24.7	18.3	25.5
San Francisco.....	30.7	17.5	27.4
Seattle.....	29.1	17.0	25.5

Average Retail Prices, December 18, 1934 (cents)

Markets	Leg of lamb (lb.)	Breast lamb (lb.)	Lamb square chuck (lb.)
United States.....	23.6	10.3	17.6
North Atlantic:			
Boston.....	23.1	12.0	15.4
Bridgeport.....	24.4	9.0	19.9
Buffalo.....	21.4	10.5	19.0
Fall River.....	23.9	9.3	17.1
Manchester.....	23.8	12.7	18.1
Newark.....	24.3	11.2	20.4
New Haven.....	24.9	9.5	15.6
New York.....	23.4	10.1	16.8
Philadelphia.....	25.9	7.0	16.0
Pittsburgh.....	24.7	11.5	19.6
Portland, Maine.....	23.4	11.7	16.4
Providence.....	22.8	9.9	18.9
Rochester.....	21.5	10.6	17.5
Scranton.....	26.0	10.1	19.2
South Atlantic:			
Atlanta.....	21.9	10.7	15.1
Baltimore.....	23.9	11.3	17.9
Charleston, S. C.....	25.6	13.8	17.5
Jacksonville.....	24.8	10.2	18.9
Norfolk.....	23.5	9.9	13.6
Richmond.....	25.9	11.6	18.4
Savannah.....	23.8	13.6	-----
Washington, D. C.....	23.4	9.9	19.3
North Central:			
Chicago.....	23.1	9.5	19.4
Cincinnati.....	23.9	11.9	19.1
Cleveland.....	24.2	10.6	20.4
Columbus.....	26.0	11.8	20.6
Detroit.....	24.1	10.4	19.9
Indianapolis.....	27.1	11.6	19.2
Kansas City.....	23.5	11.8	18.4
Milwaukee.....	23.9	9.3	18.3
Minneapolis.....	22.1	8.5	17.4
Omaha.....	20.8	7.8	15.2
Peoria.....	24.5	10.4	17.9
St. Louis.....	22.3	11.9	17.7
St. Paul.....	21.4	8.4	18.2
Springfield, Ill.....	23.4	8.5	15.7
South Central:			
Birmingham.....	23.4	10.6	15.5
Dallas.....	26.3	16.4	17.8
Houston.....	24.1	11.5	13.9
Little Rock.....	23.8	11.2	15.9
Louisville.....	27.2	12.9	18.0
Memphis.....	23.7	9.4	14.1
Mobile.....	23.5	11.2	15.7
New Orleans.....	24.6	10.4	15.0
Western:			
Butte.....	21.4	10.1	17.5
Denver.....	20.9	8.7	16.0
Los Angeles.....	23.0	10.0	15.8
Portland, Oreg.....	20.3	8.7	16.1
Salt Lake City.....	21.9	9.0	17.1
San Francisco.....	25.1	8.7	15.6
Seattle.....	22.5	10.2	18.0

LAMB

LAMB PRICES at retail advanced slightly from December 4 to 18. Leg of lamb and square chuck advanced 0.2 cent per pound while breast of lamb advanced 0.1 cent.

RECEIPTS OF SHEEP and lambs at seven principal markets for the week ending December 22 were approximately 152,000 head. During the following week, ending the 29th, receipts dropped to about 131,000 which was 57,000 less than for the corresponding week in 1933. The supply was relatively small during the early part of the week and prices advanced sharply resulting in increasing supplies and some decline in fat lamb prices during the latter part of the week. Closing prices were 75 cents to \$1.00 higher than those at the close of the previous week.

SHIPMENTS of feeder lambs into Corn Belt States declined during the last week in December but held fairly close to the shipments for the corresponding week of 1933. With higher feed prices than prevailed in November it seems likely that stock will be held on feed somewhat shorter time than usual.

FARM PRICES of both sheep and lambs advanced about 4 percent and 2.5 percent, respectively, during the month ended on December 15. At the present level lamb prices are 68 percent of parity while sheep prices are 47 percent.

POULTRY AND EGGS

EGG PRICES declined 2.3 cents per dozen between December 4 and December 18, which was the greatest change of any commodity for which prices are reported. Prices of hens advanced 0.1 cent per pound.

ANNUAL CYCLE of egg production usually reaches its lowest point in December, advances rapidly to a peak in April and then follows a gradual decline to December. Retail prices of fresh eggs tend to follow just the reverse of this production cycle. Prices generally reach the lowest point of the year in April, advance to a high point in November, then decline again to April. This year's decline in the average price of eggs during December is therefore about the usual seasonal movement to be expected at this period. Whether or not prices will continue downward at the usual rate this year is somewhat problematical because of several factors, the chief of which are the reduction which has taken place in flocks and the relative shortage and high prices of poultry feed.

WHOLESALE PRICES of eggs dropped to the middle of December, but since have strengthened and show some increase up through the first week in January. Receipts of eggs continue to run much lighter than a year ago. Cold-storage holdings at the close of December were about 9 percent less than held at the close of December 1933.

FARM PRICES of eggs declined about 5.6 percent during the period from November 15 to December 15 while live chickens held at the same level for the month. Egg prices on December 15 were 66 percent and chickens 81 percent of the pre-war parity prices.

Average Retail Prices, December 18, 1934 (cents)

Markets	Hens (lb.)	Eggs (doz.)
United States.....	24.5	37.3
North Atlantic:		
Boston.....	26.2	45.2
Bridgeport.....	27.6	48.5
Buffalo.....	26.4	37.2
Fall River.....	25.9	42.2
Manchester.....	26.4	37.6
Newark.....	28.2	43.6
New Haven.....	27.7	43.9
New York.....	26.9	42.6
Philadelphia.....	28.6	38.5
Pittsburgh.....	25.2	39.4
Portland, Maine.....	25.7	41.3
Providence.....	26.1	43.1
Rochester.....	24.4	38.8
Scranton.....	28.8	40.8
South Atlantic:		
Atlanta.....	22.7	38.0
Baltimore.....	27.4	38.1
Charleston, S. C.....	22.9	37.1
Jacksonville.....	25.3	46.0
Norfolk.....	24.8	38.5
Richmond.....	26.7	38.1
Savannah.....	21.2	35.3
Washington, D. C.....	28.4	43.9
North Central:		
Chicago.....	24.6	37.1
Cincinnati.....	25.5	37.8
Cleveland.....	27.4	34.6
Columbus.....	26.3	36.0
Detroit.....	27.2	32.4
Indianapolis.....	22.8	32.3
Kansas City.....	21.7	34.5
Milwaukee.....	21.3	36.5
Minneapolis.....	22.4	32.3
Omaha.....	20.5	33.8
Peoria.....	22.7	36.0
St. Louis.....	23.3	34.1
St. Paul.....	22.6	32.2
Springfield, Ill.....	21.5	36.6
South Central:		
Birmingham.....	18.4	38.6
Dallas.....	19.5	40.9
Houston.....	22.8	39.5
Little Rock.....	18.6	30.7
Louisville.....	19.8	35.8
Memphis.....	19.5	30.2
Mobile.....	20.0	32.9
New Orleans.....	21.7	32.2
Western:		
Butte.....	20.3	39.1
Denver.....	20.2	39.4
Los Angeles.....	28.4	35.8
Portland, Oreg.....	23.4	30.1
Salt Lake City.....	24.4	32.1
San Francisco.....	30.4	34.6
Seattle.....	26.2	32.9

Average Retail Prices, December 18, 1934 (cents)

Markets	Potatoes (lb.)	Onions (lb.)	Cabbage (lb.)
United States.....	1.7	4.1	2.8
North Atlantic:			
Boston.....	1.2	4.1	3.3
Bridgeport.....	1.4	4.3	3.0
Buffalo.....	1.1	4.0	1.5
Fall River.....	1.2	4.4	2.7
Manchester.....	1.1	4.0	2.8
Newark.....	1.6	4.3	3.1
New Haven.....	1.0	4.3	3.3
New York.....	1.8	4.6	4.3
Philadelphia.....	1.7	3.9	2.5
Pittsburgh.....	1.5	4.1	2.3
Portland, Maine.....	1.1	3.8	2.4
Providence.....	1.3	3.9	2.9
Rochester.....	.8	3.5	1.9
Scranton.....	1.2	4.9	2.2
South Atlantic:			
Atlanta.....	2.1	4.8	2.8
Baltimore.....	1.6	4.3	3.9
Charleston, S. C.....	2.0	5.1	3.0
Jacksonville.....	1.7	4.4	2.8
Norfolk.....	1.8	4.7	3.9
Richmond.....	1.6	4.7	3.5
Savannah.....	1.6	4.3	2.8
Washington, D. C.....	1.7	4.7	4.4
North Central:			
Chicago.....	1.9	4.1	2.9
Cincinnati.....	1.9	4.0	2.7
Cleveland.....	1.5	3.7	2.0
Columbus.....	1.3	4.0	2.5
Detroit.....	1.0	3.4	2.5
Indianapolis.....	1.2	4.0	2.7
Kansas City.....	2.3	4.8	2.4
Milwaukee.....	1.2	3.7	2.0
Minneapolis.....	1.9	3.9	2.4
Omaha.....	2.1	5.1	2.5
Peoria.....	1.5	4.6	2.4
St. Louis.....	2.0	4.0	1.4
St. Paul.....	1.6	4.1	2.3
Springfield, Ill.....	1.6	4.8	2.0
South Central:			
Birmingham.....	2.1	4.6	2.3
Dallas.....	3.3	5.8	4.1
Houston.....	2.5	4.5	2.8
Little Rock.....	2.4	4.0	2.9
Louisville.....	1.9	4.1	3.1
Memphis.....	2.3	4.3	2.8
Mobile.....	2.0	3.7	2.9
New Orleans.....	2.1	4.0	3.7
Western:			
Butte.....	1.6	3.9	3.4
Denver.....	2.3	4.0	3.1
Los Angeles.....	2.3	3.5	1.9
Portland, Oreg.....	1.5	3.3	2.1
Salt Lake City.....	1.5	2.9	2.2
San Francisco.....	2.2	3.6	6.4
Seattle.....	1.8	2.7	2.5

VEGETABLES

(Fresh)

POTATO PRICES made no change between December 4 and 18. Onions advanced 0.1 cent, and cabbage 0.2 cent per pound. Usually from November to the following July potato prices rise seasonally.

PRODUCTION of potatoes in the United States in 1934 was a fifth larger than the crop of 1933 and the largest since 1928. The late potato States, from which practically all of the supplies of potatoes for the next month or two will come, produced 312,034,000 bushels in 1934 which is about 20 percent more than the production of 1933 and about 7 percent larger than average.

SLIGHT ADVANCE in onion prices was about in line with the usual seasonal movement. Production of onions in 1934 was about 8.5 percent greater than in 1933. Distribution of supplies varied considerably between the different areas. In the central States production dropped about 10 percent below 1933 while in the eastern late States (Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania) the crop was about 21 percent larger than in 1933 and the largest crop in a number of years. In the western States the 1934 crop was about the same as for the previous year.

CABBAGE PRODUCTION in 1934 was larger than for any recent year and low prices resulted in considerable quantities being left unharvested. Supplies are still larger than in 1933 or 1932. Shipments of cabbage up to the middle of December were nearly 55 percent heavier than for the corresponding period in 1933 and were still running considerably heavier up through the week ending January 1, 1935.

VEGETABLES

(Fresh)

HEAD LETTUCE advanced 0.5 cent per head, spinach 1.9 cents per pound, and carrots 0.5 cent per bunch during the period from December 4 to 18.

LETTUCE shipments up to December 15 were heavier than for the same period last year. Shipments during the week ending December 15, however, were considerably lighter than for the preceding week and only about three-fourths as large as for the corresponding week in 1933.

JUMP in retail spinach prices may have been influenced by the freeze in the South on December 11. Total supplies, however, have been running lighter than a year ago. Movement during the week ending December 15 was only a little over two-thirds as large as for the corresponding week of 1933.

DECEMBER FREEZE extended from Alabama east through Florida and north to South Carolina and damaged the growing vegetable crop to considerable extent. In Florida the entire acreage of green beans, eggplants, peas, fall peppers and fall tomatoes was practically wiped out. The effect will be to reduce temporarily supplies of certain of these commodities coming on the market and prices are now advancing. There will be considerable new planting of vegetables as plant beds were not seriously affected. The important vegetable producing areas in Texas were not damaged by the freeze and supplies from this area will therefore not be affected.

Average Retail Prices, December 18, 1934 (cents)

Markets	Lettuce (head)	Spinach (lb.)	Carrots (bunch)
United States.....	9.3	8.9	5.8
North Atlantic:			
Boston.....	9.7	10.4	7.0
Bridgeport.....	11.7	11.0	6.9
Buffalo.....	9.4	9.2	5.2
Fall River.....	10.6	10.2	6.2
Manchester.....	11.8	9.2	7.3
Newark.....	11.2	11.5	7.1
New Haven.....	10.4	15.6	6.6
New York.....	12.0	11.8	7.2
Philadelphia.....	10.6	11.7	6.8
Pittsburgh.....	10.8	10.4	6.2
Portland, Maine.....	10.7	11.1	5.0
Providence.....	10.8	11.4	7.0
Rochester.....	9.9	8.6	4.5
Scranton.....	10.5	9.1	7.6
South Atlantic:			
Atlanta.....	9.7	8.6	7.3
Baltimore.....	10.4	12.6	7.0
Charleston, S. C.....	10.2	10.0	6.7
Jacksonville.....	9.1	11.3	7.8
Norfolk.....	9.0	6.6	6.7
Richmond.....	9.4	8.6	7.6
Savannah.....	9.6	11.0	8.1
Washington, D. C.....	9.8	11.0	7.6
North Central:			
Chicago.....	10.5	11.5	6.1
Cincinnati.....	10.1	8.8	5.7
Cleveland.....	10.4	8.2	5.2
Columbus.....	9.5	8.5	6.4
Detroit.....	9.6	9.9	6.1
Indianapolis.....	9.9	7.4	5.6
Kansas City.....	9.6	7.0	6.1
Milwaukee.....	9.6	9.5	5.5
Minneapolis.....	9.5	10.6	6.2
Omaha.....	9.2	9.1	5.8
Peoria.....	9.3	9.3	6.9
St. Louis.....	9.7	9.1	5.7
St. Paul.....	9.7	9.7	5.8
Springfield, Ill.....	10.0	8.5	7.2
South Central:			
Birmingham.....	8.5	7.5	5.5
Dallas.....	6.5	8.2	5.7
Houston.....	6.5	6.3	4.8
Little Rock.....	6.8	5.3	5.6
Louisville.....	9.2	5.1	5.3
Memphis.....	7.9	5.3	5.4
Mobile.....	8.6	6.8	5.1
New Orleans.....	8.4	5.1	3.9
Western:			
Butte.....	9.9	10.2	5.0
Denver.....	8.8	7.7	4.7
Los Angeles.....	5.1	2.7	2.7
Portland, Oreg.....	6.2	7.1	2.8
Salt Lake City.....	8.3	10.8	3.8
San Francisco.....	4.2	5.8	2.4
Seattle.....	7.7	5.8	2.2

Average Retail Prices, December 18, 1934 (cents)

Market	Apples (lb.)	Bananas (doz., lb. *)	Oranges (doz.)
United States.....	5.9	22.3	28.8
North Atlantic:			
Boston.....	6.8	*6.4	30.1
Bridgeport.....	6.5	*7.4	32.2
Buffalo.....	4.5	25.2	28.7
Fall River.....	7.5	*6.8	28.6
Manchester.....	5.7	*6.4	29.9
Newark.....	6.3	22.9	33.3
New Haven.....	6.1	23.1	30.9
New York.....	7.1	23.0	33.5
Philadelphia.....	5.6	20.8	29.9
Pittsburgh.....	5.7	25.7	33.4
Portland, Maine.....	5.7	*7.2	30.8
Providence.....	6.7	*6.4	30.2
Rochester.....	4.2	24.5	29.6
Scranton.....	5.0	18.5	26.7
South Atlantic:			
Atlanta.....	5.5	21.9	22.4
Baltimore.....	5.2	20.0	29.2
Charleston, S. C.....	5.8	20.8	16.1
Jacksonville.....	6.0	15.7	19.2
Norfolk.....	4.9	19.7	26.9
Richmond.....	6.0	24.8	26.6
Savannah.....	5.0	21.2	18.6
Washington, D. C.....	5.0	23.6	32.2
North Central:			
Chicago.....	7.1	*6.6	31.2
Cincinnati.....	6.5	*6.1	30.6
Cleveland.....	5.7	*6.5	25.7
Columbus.....	5.7	*6.9	33.7
Detroit.....	5.8	*5.7	29.7
Indianapolis.....	6.2	*7.1	30.0
Kansas City.....	6.4	*6.5	31.3
Milwaukee.....	6.0	*6.2	27.6
Minneapolis.....	6.2	*7.6	29.0
Omaha.....	6.1	*7.8	28.2
Peoria.....	6.8	*7.1	27.8
St. Louis.....	6.4	*6.3	28.4
St. Paul.....	6.5	*7.9	29.9
Springfield, Ill.....	6.7	*7.1	26.3
South Central:			
Birmingham.....	6.0	*5.1	21.4
Dallas.....		*6.7	32.2
Houston.....		16.5	25.5
Little Rock.....	6.0	*5.2	28.6
Louisville.....	5.8	*6.3	26.3
Memphis.....	6.0	*5.2	26.3
Mobile.....	6.3	15.3	22.3
New Orleans.....	5.0	15.0	25.0
Western:			
Butte.....	6.2	*9.3	29.6
Denver.....	5.6	*7.2	28.7
Los Angeles.....	6.8	*5.6	17.1
Portland, Oreg.....	3.2	*7.6	25.0
Salt Lake City.....	5.6	*7.5	22.5
San Francisco.....	5.4	20.6	15.0
Seattle.....	3.9	*5.7	25.7

FRUIT

(Fresh)

APPLE PRICES advanced seasonally 0.2 cent per pound while banana and orange prices declined 0.2 cent and 1.5 cents, respectively, during the period from December 4 to 18.

TOTAL APPLE CROP produced in 1934 was about 23 percent less than average and 16 percent smaller than the crop of 1933. With a rather short apple crop the seasonal advance in prices usually starts earlier and goes higher than with a large crop. If this relationship holds for the present season the seasonal trend in apple prices may be expected to continue upward until the new crop of 1935 begins to reach the market. Many apples went into storage in rather overripe condition, however, and should breakdown in storage become serious, some fruit may be forced on the market in the early winter months which would tend to hold back the seasonal movement to some extent.

DECLINE in orange prices was only to be expected as shipments increase with the advance in harvesting. The total citrus crop for market during the 1934-35 season, which was forecast as the largest ever produced, may show important changes due to freeze damage and subsequent weather. The freeze which occurred in Florida about the middle of December is reported to have caused considerable damage to oranges, particularly tangerines, and somewhat less damage to grapefruit.

Average Retail Prices, December 18, 1934 (cents)

Markets	Peaches #2½ can	Pears #2½ can	Pineapple #2½ can	Corn #2 can	Peas #2 can	Tomatoes #2 can (2½*)
United States.....	19.3	22.6	22.6	12.4	17.3	10.4
North Atlantic:						
Boston.....	19.3	22.1	22.3	13.4	17.4	11.6
Bridgeport.....	19.4	24.2	22.5	13.9	19.5	11.8
Buffalo.....	20.5	24.6	22.6	12.3	15.9	10.8
Fall River.....	18.7	22.3	22.3	12.4	17.6	10.1
Manchester.....	20.0	23.6	23.4	12.8	17.6	11.1
Newark.....	17.4	21.6	22.0	12.9	18.4	10.0
New Haven.....	15.1	21.5	21.6	12.4	15.9	10.0
New York.....	17.5	21.4	20.9	12.5	16.9	10.4
Philadelphia.....	19.2	22.1	22.2	12.4	18.6	11.3
Pittsburgh.....	19.0	22.3	23.1	11.6	17.1	12.0
Portland, Maine.....	20.8	23.9	23.7	12.9	17.3	10.9
Providence.....	18.6	20.9	22.3	12.8	18.5	9.9
Rochester.....	21.2	22.8	22.9	13.3	16.0	11.4
Scranton.....	19.7	21.6	22.3	13.5	17.5	10.6
South Atlantic:						
Atlanta.....	18.5	24.3	24.3	12.4	18.5	9.6
Baltimore.....	17.4	21.1	20.3	13.5	15.9	10.1
Charleston, S. C.....	17.7	21.9	22.2	11.4	17.1	9.6
Jacksonville.....	17.9	22.7	22.1	12.5	16.0	8.9
Norfolk.....	19.8	23.8	23.2	11.4	15.4	9.4
Richmond.....	18.9	23.6	22.4	12.0	19.0	8.9
Savannah.....	20.0	23.7	23.3	13.3	19.9	8.9
Washington, D. C.....	18.4	22.6	21.8	11.5	14.9	9.4
North Central:						
Chicago.....	21.3	24.8	24.0	13.0	16.8	11.4
Cincinnati.....	18.7	22.6	22.2	10.8	17.3	9.8
Cleveland.....	19.8	22.8	22.7	13.0	15.8	10.9
Columbus.....	20.0	24.9	23.4	11.0	16.9	10.1
Detroit.....	19.1	23.0	23.0	11.3	18.6	10.1
Indianapolis.....	18.3	26.1	23.6	11.6	17.3	9.9
Kansas City.....	19.9	22.6	22.8	10.5	16.5	9.6
Milwaukee.....	21.2	23.1	24.0	12.9	18.4	10.6
Minneapolis.....	21.0	24.4	24.5	11.0	17.0	10.9
Omaha.....	20.6	24.1	23.4	12.1	17.0	11.5
Peoria.....	20.5	25.1	23.7	13.5	17.6	11.3
St. Louis.....	17.9	23.4	22.7	11.8	17.4	9.5
St. Paul.....	21.4	22.7	23.8	12.5	16.1	11.0
Springfield, Ill.....	21.0	25.3	25.4	13.6	18.9	12.1
South Central:						
Birmingham.....	19.8	21.7	24.0	12.9	16.0	9.4
Dallas.....	20.2	24.3	23.3	13.0	21.0	10.4
Houston.....	18.1	21.8	20.8	12.8	16.5	8.8
Little Rock.....	20.5	25.4	23.6	12.0	18.8	9.6
Louisville.....	19.8	22.3	22.8	11.9	16.6	9.8
Memphis.....	18.8	22.3	21.8	11.8	15.5	10.0
Mobile.....	17.5	19.2	19.8	11.3	18.0	9.1
New Orleans.....	18.8	22.6	22.0	12.3	19.8	9.4
Western:						
Butte.....	20.9	24.4	24.4	13.9	16.8	11.4
Denver.....	20.4	23.2	23.9	13.1	18.0	11.0
Los Angeles.....	16.1	18.9	19.0	12.4	16.3	*14.2
Portland, Oreg.....	19.8	20.7	21.2	13.4	17.9	*13.8
Salt Lake City.....	20.9	23.1	22.8	12.9	15.9	*13.1
San Francisco.....	17.5	19.7	19.9	13.0	15.8	*13.3
Seattle.....	19.6	20.0	21.5	13.0	18.1	*15.1

Consumer-Farmer Briefs

[Concluded from Page 9]

WATCH for economies in sizes of can. A 6-ounce can bought for 4 cents costs about 2 cents more per pound than a 14½-ounce can at 8 cents. Always look for the net weight on the can. Figure the cost per ounce by dividing the price by the net weight.

AAA

FARMERS in Oregon purchased co-operatively \$2,009,000 worth of supplies in 1933. Nineteen of the 31 cooperatives reporting were organized as purchasing associations; 12 as marketing organizations that handled supplies for their members. One of them did a State-wide business; the others, local. Principal products handled by 10 cooperatives were oil and gas; 12 specialized on feed and seed. Marketing type co-ops handled mostly orchard and fruit packing supplies, sacks, wire, fertilizer and other farm supplies.

AAA

TEA LOVERS can have quality standards all their own way. Not a pound enters the United States without being compared with standard samples for purity, quality, and fitness for consumption. A Board of Tea Experts, who prepare and submit the standard samples, is appointed each year by the Secretary of Agriculture.

AAA

HEALTHIER COWS—which means healthier milk—are promised to consumers. With the aid of AAA emergency funds, an intensified nation-wide campaign for the eradication of tuberculosis and Bang's disease is helping to eliminate these risks to milk purity. During November 1934, a total of 2,122,035 cattle were tuberculin-tested, more than in any previous month. Work against Bang's disease was carried on in 44 States, and arrangements made for removing infected

cattle. With the beginning of the new year, this health-control work was extended to mastitis, with an AAA appropriation of \$800,000, part of which will be used to pay farmers for any cattle that have to be slaughtered.

AAA

FOUR HUNDRED mountain farmers at Banner Elk, N. C., formed one of the first units of the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, organized under local leadership and with the help of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Along with other farm cooperatives, organized at Cranberry, Green Mountain, Waynesville, Hendersonville and Murphy (all North Carolina mountain towns) and at Soddy Grove, Tennessee, the Banner Elk group built a cooperative cannery and went into potato growing. Members in this one cooperative expect \$25,000 profits from their harvest.

On the Consumer Front

[Concluded from Page 6]

THIRD is establishing standards for consumer goods and labelling them in such a way that consumers can know what they are buying.

WHETHER the scope of consumer protection within the New Deal is to be broadened and take a more permanent place, it is too early to state. Opposition to its growth is apparent on every hand. Vested interests in the agricultural, industrial, commercial, and financial fields have not become enlightened over night. As with the general development of the New Deal, the fate of the consumer movement lies in the hands of the great mass of people as they express themselves, both through their direct contacts with the Government and in their judgments at the polls. To some extent it will be determined also by what the present representatives of consumers in Washington do. To a far greater extent it will be determined by what the country at large makes of the opportunities created for the consumer under the New Deal.

OUR POINT OF VIEW

THE CONSUMERS' GUIDE believes that consumption is the end and purpose of production.

To that end the CONSUMERS' GUIDE emphasizes the consumer's right to full and correct information on prices, quality of commodities, and on costs and efficiency of distribution. It aims to aid consumers in making wise and economical purchases by reporting changes in prices and costs of food and farm commodities. It relates these changes to developments in the agricultural and general programs of national recovery. It reports on cooperative efforts which are being made by individuals and groups of consumers to obtain the greatest possible value for their expenditures.

The producer of raw materials—the farmer—is dependent upon the consuming power of the people. Likewise the consumer depends upon the sustained producing power of agriculture. The common interests of consumers and of agriculture far outweigh diversity of interests.

While the CONSUMERS' GUIDE makes public official data of the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, and Commerce, the point of view expressed in its pages does not necessarily reflect official policy but is a presentation of governmental and non-governmental measures looking toward the advancement of consumers' interests.

Issued by the **CONSUMERS' COUNSEL** of the Agricultural
Adjustment Administration
in cooperation with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Bureau of Home
Economics, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

VOL. 2, No. 7

JAN. 14, 1935

